Joint Warfighting Concept Development

Round 1 Pros & Cons

DOD HLS JOC Perspective

Col Karin Murphy
USNORTHCOM J5
DSN 692-9142

Pros

- **DOD HLS JOC development effort helped us clarify DOD's role in Homeland Defense versus Homeland Security**
  - **Identification of the "seam" between HLD and HLS**
  - **Brought issues of HLD and HLS to the table**
- **DOD HLS JOC constructs helped influence other strategic documents (SPG, Defense Strategy, etc.)**
  - **Active Defense in Depth**
- **JOC development at the unclassified level allowed concepts to be widely distributed**

Cons

- **HLS JOC development and coordination frequently complicated by:**
  - **Lack of understanding of where / how concepts fit in JCIDS process**
  - **Guidance changes (e.g. role and relationships of Service Concepts, Enabling Concepts, Joint Integrating Concepts, etc)**
  - **Concurrent concept development and emerging strategic guidance and policy**

➢ **Recommendation: Finalize the JOpsC portfolio and how each concept fits within JCIDS process; clearly define way ahead**

Cons (cont)

- **JOC concepts not readily incorporated into doctrine development process (e.g. use of JOpsC / HLS JOC concepts in JP 3-26)**
  - **Current process to move concepts to doctrine lags concept development and is not keeping pace with strategy, planning, and doctrine**
    - **Recommendation: Establish a closer linkage during development between concepts and emerging doctrine**

Cons (cont)

- **Degree (and venue) of desired future capabilities development unclear**
  - **Conflicting terminology / definitions impede understanding**

  JICs (purpose, number, topics)

  - **Role / Level of Experimentation**

➢ **Recommendation:**

- **Standardize terminology / definitions**
- **Clarify role, relationship, and responsibilities of JOCs, JFCs, Service / Enabling Concepts, JICs, Joint and Service Roadmaps, and Integrated Architectures**
- **Once defined, obtain consensus across the Department of Defense**

DISCUSSION